

Olga KICH-MASŁEJ

Department of Ukrainian Studies

UKRAINE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF CRACOW AT THE TURN OF THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES AND THE ACTIVITIES OF MARIAN ZDZIECHOWSKI IN THE FIELD OF UKRAINIAN STUDIES

INTRODUCTION

The person and work of Marian Zdziechowski¹ were forgotten for many years. It happened for political reasons, and because history was studied in a non-scholarly fashion, and focussed upon social processes, mass occurrences etc., but omitted the influence of individuals on the understanding of reality.² From the works being published nowadays (especially since Poland and Ukraine regained independence) there emerges the figure of Zdziechowski as a remarkable expert on Slavdom, includ-

¹ Marian Zdziechowski (born 04.30.1861, died 10.05.1938) Polish historian of ideas and literature, philologist, philosopher, literary critic and columnist, the rector of Stefan Batory University in Vilnius. From 1888 he lived in Cracow where he received his doctorate at the Jagiellonian University based on his work "Messianists and Slavophiles" written under the direction of professor Stanisław Tarnowski. In 1899-1919 he was professor at the Jagiellonian University. In 1901 one of the founders of the 'Slavic Club' in Cracow as well as the journal 'The Slavic World'. Since 1902 he was a member of the Academy of Knowledge. In the years 1919-1932 he was professor of Vilnius University where he held a chair of European Literatures. In the years 1925-1927 he was the rector of the university; also he was the dean of the Humanities department. In Vilnius he was also professor at the School of Political Sciences at the Society for Research on Eastern Europe. He was also chairman of the Trade Union of Polish Writers (ZZLP). In May 1926 he was among candidates for the office of the president of Poland. He was doctor honoris causa of the universities in Vilnius, Dorpat and Segedyn.

² Cf. Z. Opacki, *W kręgu Polski, Rosji i Słowiańszczyzny. Myśl i działalność społeczno-polityczna Mariana Zdziechowskiego do 1914 roku*, Gdańsk 1996, p. 5.

ing above all else Russia.³ Among the scholars dealing with this figure who helped to discover so much about Poland's neighbours, very few refer in their studies to Zdziechowski's interest in Ukraine.⁴ Jan Skoczyński remarked aptly that, 'neither experts on Polish-Ukrainian relations nor the adversaries engaged in the long-running quarrel refer too often to the achievements of Cracow Slavophiles' (for example, members of Slavic Club, including M. Zdziechowski – O.K.-M.).⁵

One can distinguish three periods when it comes to Marian Zdziechowski's interest in Ukrainian issues. The first period covers the 1880s and it deals with the incipient phase of his scholarly activity, including his emergence as a scholar of Slavic literatures in the field of comparative literature. Then, he wrote, 'Messianists and Slavophiles: Sketches on the Psychology of Slavic Nations,' in which he expressed his opinions about Ukraine. The deliberations on Ukrainian messianism which he considered in

³ Cf. S. Kościalkowski, 'Marian Zdziechowski', *Kultura*, No. 1-2 (1964); E. Sławęcka, 'Literatura i kultura rosyjska w działalności krakowskiego Klubu Słowiańskiego', *Slavia Orientalis*, No. 3 (1971), pp. 281-298; T. Weiss, 'Od pozytywizmu do mesjanizmu – ewolucja ideowa Mariana Zdziechowskiego' in A. Hochweld, B. Skarga (eds.), *Z historii filozofii pozytywistycznej w Polsce. Ciągłość i przemiany*, Wrocław 1972, pp. 241-250; J. Widacha, 'Utopia słowianofilska w badaniach Mariana Zdziechowskiego nad romantyzmem rosyjskim' in R. Łużny (ed.), *Studia z dziejów rusycystyki historycznoliterackiej w Polsce*, Wrocław 1976, pp. 65-80; A. Walicki, 'Zdziechowski. Eschatologia a millenaryzm', *Znak*, No. 4-5 (1981), pp. 508-511; I. Burzacka, *Ideaal a rzeczywistość. O krytyce moralistycznej Mariana Zdziechowskiego*, Warszawa 1982; M. Zaczynski, 'Nota wydawcy do Mowy Pana Mariana Zdziechowskiego', *Znak*, No. 3 (1982), pp. 142-144; J. Skoczyński, 'Marian Zdziechowski wobec niektórych kontrowersji epoki modernizmu', *Archiwum Historii Filozofii i Myśli Społecznej*, Vol. 27 (1983); idem, *Pesymizm filozoficzny Mariana Zdziechowskiego*, Wrocław 1983; idem, 'Obecność Zdziechowskiego', *Znak*, No. 9 (1986), pp. 64-74; idem, 'Odkrywanie Zdziechowskiego', *Znak*, No. 5/6 (1984); idem, 'Kiedy urodził się Marian Zdziechowski?', *Ruch Literacki*, Vol. 27, No. 2 (1986), pp. 143-145; idem, 'Zdziechowski raz jeszcze' in idem, *Ludzie i idee. Szkice historyczno-filozoficzne*, Kraków 1999, pp. 79-87; Z. Solak, 'Marian Zdziechowski i Klub Słowiański', *Studia Historyczne*, No. 2 (1987), pp. 219-239; M. Pąckiński, 'Mesjanizm i słowianofilstwo Mariana Zdziechowskiego', *Przegląd Humanistyczny*, No. 2 (1989), pp. 65-79; M. Wyka, 'Zdziechowski i Brzozowski – czyli konserwatysta i radykał w paru punktach wspólnych', *Rocznik Komisji Historycznoliterackiej*, Vol. 27 (1990), pp. 93-105; T. Stegner, *Liberałowie Królestwa Polskiego 1904-1915*, Gdańsk 1990; idem, *Pastorzy Królestwa Polskiego na studiach teologicznych w Dorpacie w XIX w.*, Warszawa 1993; Z. Niedziela, 'Marian Zdziechowski jako badacz literatury czeskiej', *Zeszyty Naukowe UJ. Prace Historycznoliterackie*, No. 84 (1993), pp. 77-82; Z. Opacki, 'Marian Zdziechowski w Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim w l. 1894-1914', *Studia Historyczne*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (1995), pp. 365-380; idem, *W kręgu Polski, Rosji...*

⁴ About interests of Zdziechowski in the Ukrainian Studies: E. Sławęcka, 'Literatura ukraińska w działalności krakowskiego Klubu Słowiańskiego (1901-1914)' in S. Kozak, M. Jakóbiec (eds.), *Z dziejów stosunków literackich polsko-ukraińskich*, Wrocław 1974, pp. 205-219; W. Mokry, 'Marian Zdziechowski jako rzecznik porozumienia polsko-ukraińskiego', *Krakowskie Zeszyty Ukrainoznawcze*, Vol. 1-2 (1992-1993), pp. 71-77; J. Skoczyński, 'Marian Zdziechowski wobec kwestii ukraińskiej', *Krakowskie Zeszyty Ukrainoznawcze*, Vol. 1-2 (1992-1993), p. 67; idem, 'Zgoda z Ukrainą: racje konserwatysty' in idem, *Wartość pesymizmu. Studia i szkice o Marianie Zdziechowskim*, Kraków 1994, pp. 123-128; O. Kich-Maslej, 'Українська проблематика у діяльності Слов'янського Клубу і на сторінках щомісячника „Слов'янський світ” у роки 1901-1914' in W. Mokry (ed.), *Język, literatura, kultura, historia Ukrainy. Materiały międzynarodowej konferencji naukowej poświęconej dziesięcioleciu krakowskiej ukrainistyki uniwersyteckiej*, Kraków 2003, pp. 133-143.

⁵ J. Skoczyński, 'Marian Zdziechowski wobec kwestii ukraińskiej', p. 68.

a sketch of the work of Taras Szewczenko and Mikołaj Gogol showed his deep understanding of the problems relating to Ukrainian identity in the nineteenth century.

The second period, which is the one that interests us the most, is connected with his stay in Cracow, his work at the Jagiellonian University and his activity in the Slavic Club from 1888 to 1914. Zdziechowski then became not only the person who integrated the activities of Cracow's Slavists, for whom the Ukrainian issue was an important part of scholarly research, but he also became a socio-political activist trying through the Club and its journal 'The Slavic World' to open up Cracow society and the Poles in general to the problems of Ukrainians.

The third period covers the 1920s and 1930s when Zdziechowski, who had been a Jagiellonian University professor for many years, moved to Vilnius. He engaged in socio-political activities there, which were enriched by his historical and journalistic sketches, in which he expressed in the clearest way possible his views on Polish-Ukrainian and Russo-Ukrainian relations. In his works collected in the volume 'The Spectre of the Past,' he stated his most considered opinions. He included in it all the phases of the understanding of a major problem for Ukraine – Russia – from the agreement in Perejaślaw in 1654; and its evolution towards the acceptance of 'mazepism;' that is, the independence of Ukraine from Russia.

In this context it seems justified to try to show the Ukrainian issues contained in the work of Marian Zdziechowski as a whole. One starts with his declarations at the beginning of his scholarly career about his plans for studying Ukrainian literature, the mentality of the nation, the history of Polish-Ukrainian relations, and ends with his scholarly analyses, journalism and publishing and his organisational activities, especially those that promoted education.

CRACOW – HIS PLACE OF WORK FOR BRINGING POLES AND UKRAINIANS CLOSER TOGETHER

The tragic end of the January uprising caused many Polish landowners from Russian, Lithuanian and White Russian lands to emigrate to Austrian annexed territory (*za-bór*). Just like many others, Marian Zdziechowski came to Cracow not being able to tolerate Russian restrictions and limitations on the political life of the Poles. The Austrian annexed territory seemed to emigrants to be completely different. Zdziechowski expressed this notion in his sketch 'Poland after 1863:' '(...) I felt some wild joy when, having finished university studies at Dorpat, I crossed the frontier for the first time in Szczakow. I felt the wind of freedom and understood that Galicia with its autonomy, with Polish schools, with its influence on governmental issues and Austrian policies was similar to the Warsaw Duchy at the beginning of the century – a source of all hopes and the harbinger of their fulfilment.'⁶

⁶ M. Zdziechowski, 'Polska po roku 1863' in idem, *Widmo przyszłości. Szkice historyczno-publicystyczne*, Wilno 1939, p. 27.

From the perspective of the young scholar, Galicia was the best place to learn the history and culture of Ukraine, to work for a Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation, which Zdziechowski was already advocating at the beginning of his scholarly activity. In 1937, he wrote about his youthful plans which he fulfilled to a large extent: 'I can see in my memory my college years in Dorpat; I had dreamt about a scholarly career, about a professorship; the late Józef Siemiradzki, who was a little bit older, had roughly the same dreams, and we both wanted very much to live and be active in Lvov and to work on the reconciliation of the Poles and the Russians.'⁷

However, on the advice of Erazm Plitz, he chose Cracow as the place most suitable for conducting Polish-Ukrainian dialogue: he '(...) wisely dissuaded me from my plan, advising instead Cracow. In the future, I often had an opportunity to find out that the Poles who moved to Lvov either from the Russian annexed territory or Cracow at the beginning had warm feelings for the Ruthenians and wanted to work together with them, but they would quickly become discouraged and would often turn into intransigent enemies of Russia.'⁸ Zdziechowski understood that the Poles were also responsible for this state of affairs; he wrote that when it came to 'this discouragement part of the blame is on our side.' Invoking the statement of Archbishop Andrej Szeptycki, with whom he talked directly, Zdziechowski quoted him as saying: 'Let's put politics aside; both you and I have nothing to do with it. However, I would advise you to do one experiment: please try in that city which is their national treasure to use during one day the Russian language, that is, to express yourself in that language in the office, store or cafe and I assure you that you will encounter many impudent remarks.'⁹ The behaviour of some of the Ukrainians also did not encourage Zdziechowski to get a job in Lvov.¹⁰

A short survey of Zdziechowski's statements shows that, compared to other personalities of that time, he was especially well placed when it came to tackling the problems of borderlands: 'born in Rakow close to Minsk (but not *Wilenszczyzna* as some scholars have written) he had a considerable understanding for the complex issues of the former Polish borderlands. In the journalism he devoted to these problems, he tried to reconcile the arguments of the Polish element, which in the past had built a multinational state organism with the neighbouring elements: Ukrainian, White Russian and Lithuanian aspiring to create their own states.'¹¹

⁷ Idem, 'Pierwiaszek zachowawczy w idei ukraińskiej' in idem, *Widmo przyszłości...*, pp. 155-156.

⁸ Idem, 'Polska po roku 1863' in idem, *Widmo przyszłości...*, pp. 31-32.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Zdziechowski had reservations about, among others, Mychajła Hruszewski, who in 1894 came to Lvov and thanks to the recommendation of Wołodymyr Antonowycz took the newly established chair of history at the University of Lvov and in 1897 became the chairman of the Scientific Association named after T. Szewczenko. In his essay 'Polska po roku 1863' Zdziechowski accused Hruszewski of not adopting a conciliatory stance towards the Poles. Cf. M. Zdziechowski, 'Polska po roku 1863' in idem, *Widmo przyszłości...*, p. 33.

¹¹ J. Skoczyński, 'Idea ukraińska w oczach Mariana Zdziechowskiego', *Krakowskie Zeszyty Ukrainoznawcze*, Vol. 1-2 (1992-1993), p. 67.

The fact that Zdziechowski was able to adopt such a broad perspective on Polish-Ukrainian issues was the result of his studies of the Slavic literatures of several countries; he studied in Russian St. Petersburg and Dorpat, in Swiss Geneva and also in Austro-Hungarian Zagreb and Graz. Those travels gave him not only the knowledge of literature but also political experience, which seems to be especially important when taking into account his subsequent work in the fields of philosophy, religion, journalism and political science. Recollecting that time many years later he stressed that, 'in none of those scholarly centres where he studied the literary achievements of various nations had he encountered even the slightest discrimination against any of the Slavic literatures.'¹² This means that the problem of equal rights and tolerance was very important in his hierarchy of ethical values, and it was later instrumental in framing his interests in phenomena that were original and exceptional for each nationality, and also influenced his lack of prejudices when elaborating his own vision for his projects.

From the beginning of his stay in Cracow Marian Zdziechowski became a perceptive observer and indispensable commentator of many phenomena and occurrences and hence one of the most representative figures of the Cracow milieu. Already in the second half of the 1890s (after his wife came to Cracow) his apartment became the place for frequent meetings of the intellectual elite of this city.¹³ There emerged a new 'salon' on the cultural map of Cracow, whose characteristic trait was the acceptance of all people no matter what their social or national background. A frequent visitor to the Zdziechowskis was the editor of 'Criticism' – Wilhelm Feldman, whose publications are an interesting addition to the picture of Ukraine¹⁴ in the Cracow of the Young Poland era.

One may be tempted to say that it was in that 'salon' during many intellectual debates that Zdziechowski formed his strong interest of Ukrainian issues and quickly realized that it is important to organize people, and that all initiatives that are to be undertaken should be linked with a programme of an association. As was to be stressed later: 'what goes alone withers fruitlessly.'¹⁵ He gathered around himself many outstanding professors of Slavic literature establishing a foundation for 'widely planned and organized activity devoted to Polish-Ukrainian rapprochement through the knowledge of Ukrainian history, culture and literature.'¹⁶ In this way

¹² Ibid.

¹³ The apartment of Mr and Mrs Zdziechowski was first at Garbarska St. and later (probably from 1897) at św. Gertruda St.

¹⁴ Cf. E. Tymoczko-Tichoniuk, 'Popularyzacja ukraińskiej literatury na łamach "Krytyki" Wilhelma Feldmana', *Acta Polono-Ruthenica*, Vol. 1 (1996), pp. 393-400; eadem, 'Literatura ukraińska w krakowskiej "Krytyce"', *Studia Methodologica*, Vol. 3 (1997), pp. 113-116; eadem, 'Obraz problematyki ukraińskiej na łamach "Krytyki" Wilhelma Feldmana' in A. Ksenicz (ed.), *Słowiańszczyzna wschodnia: twórczość artystyczna a doświadczenie zbiorowe*, Zielona Góra 1998, pp. 183-195.

¹⁵ That is the reason that the editorial staff of 'The Slavic World' gives for its inception in its third anniversary report. Cf. 'Klub Słowiański w Krakowie. Sprawozdanie z trzechlecia', *Świat Słowiański*, Vol. 1 (1905).

¹⁶ W. Mokry, 'Marian Zdziechowski jako rzecznik...', p. 71.

the Slavic Club emerged, an elite association which had its own journal, 'The Slavic World'.¹⁷ Zdziechowski became an organizer of the scientific and literary-cultural life in Cracow. On many occasions, he undertook research initiatives in the field of Ukrainian literature; at the same time inspiring the people who surrounded him with his Ukrainian interests.¹⁸

A very important figure who was close to Zdziechowski at that time was Feliks Koneczny,¹⁹ who was later the editor of 'The Slavic World,' a close collaborator of the chairman of the Club, and most of all the author of the writings on Polish-Ukrainian relations.²⁰ They met each other at the beginning of the 1890s when they were active in the Cracow Literary Association, preparing lectures and literary presentations. He also met Józef Tretiak²¹ there, who was given an opportunity to set up a Ukrainian language course at the Jagiellonian University,²² and who was instrumental in bringing Bohdan Łepki to Cracow.²³ Łepki took an intense part in the popularization of

¹⁷ E. Sławęcka, 'Literatura ukraińska w działalności krakowskiego Klubu...', pp. 205-219.

¹⁸ Cf. O. Kix-Mаслей, Українська проблематика..., pp. 133-143.

¹⁹ Feliks Koneczny (born 11.01.1862, died 02.19.1949). In 1888 on the basis of the dissertation, 'The earliest relations of Inflants with Poland' he received a doctorate at the department of philosophy UJ. From 1891 to 1897 adjunct at presidium of the Academy of Knowledge and also member of Historical and Literary Commission AU. From 1897 custodian at BJ. Between 1905 to 1914 for ten years he edited and published in 'The Slavic World' monthly. In the fall of 1919 called by the rector of Stefan Batory University, Koneczny went to Vilnius (after writing his habilitation 'History of Eastern Europe' in 1920 he was made extraordinary professor at Vilnius University). Koneczny returned to Cracow where he endured the war years and the German occupation under dire circumstances.

²⁰ The author of such works as 'Oil to the fire' (On the occasion of the speech of prof. J.H. Radecki on Polish-Russian matters), *Świat Słowiański*, Vol. 2 (1906); idem, 'Swary uniwersyteckie we Lwowie', *Świat Słowiański*, Vol. 1 (1906); idem, 'Czy można dogodzić Rusinom', *Świat Słowiański*, Vol. 2 (1907).

²¹ Józef Tretiak (born 09.28.1841, died 03.18.1923) literary scholar and historian. He came from a noble family with Ukrainian roots. He graduated Kiev and Lvov Universities, taught in the secondary schools of Lvov and Cracow; from 1891 lecturer at UJ; from 1894 the professor of History of Ukrainian Literature; from 1888 member of the Academy of Knowledge; the author the study 'Old Russian Poetry'.

²² When at the turn of the century Ukrainian issues became more manifest in Cracow, a decision was made to introduce the teaching of 'Russian' language in a few secondary schools. Apart from the Ukrainians, the courses were frequented by the Poles who were planning to be teachers in the schools of the Eastern Galicia. There was a lack of proper specialists among Cracow's teachers so the National Schools' Council turned for help to Kyrył Studyński, who was a Reader at Lvov University and a friend of B. Łepki from their Vienna times. At that time, the Lvov University declined to teach the Ukrainian language so in 1894 it was decided that at the Jagiellonian University at the Slavic department, there would be organized the Ukrainian language course. Tretiak who was a Slavist did not have the time to do it, so part of the classes were taught by Studyński. However, constant traveling between Cracow and Lvov was too difficult for him so he proposed that B. Łepki could do it instead. In this way in the fall of 1899 Łepki took up the position of a secondary school teacher in Cracow, and later a teacher at UJ.

²³ Bohdan Łepki (1872-1941) a Ukrainian writer, poet and literary scholar (the author of writings in Polish about history of the Ukrainian literature) collaborator of 'The Slavic World' and a member

Ukrainian culture from 1901, when the Slavic Club began its activities, having been created by Zdziechowski; subsequently its journal, 'The Slavic World' was published from 1905.²⁴

The Slavic Club, whose aim was to learn as much as possible about Ukraine, had to overcome not only the opportunism of the large majority of the Poles, but also to convince opinion-forming Ukrainian circles about the necessity of mutual co-operation. The whole group of Polish scholars, journalists and experienced socio-political activists, gathered around the Club, were ready to attempt a reorientation of Polish society. It proved, however, to be a big problem to reach Ukrainian intellectual and political circles. Such a task could only be undertaken by somebody who, on the one hand belonged to these circles, and who on the other was convinced about the necessity of such an activity, and additionally who was highly regarded by both sides. Bohdan Łepki was the best candidate among the Ukrainians living in Cracow; and he accepted the offer at once. Although the period when the co-operation began was particularly volatile,²⁵ and which demanded from Łepki many more diplomatic skills than he had thought necessary, his activity in the Club gave him an exceptional opportunity to present Ukrainian culture to the Poles which at that time was still little known; and indirectly it helped to diffuse Polish-Ukrainian disturbances.

of Slavic Club; professor of UJ, senator of the Polish Parliament of V term. In the years 1899-1915 and 1925-1941 a teacher and then professor of the Jagiellonian University.

²⁴ It would be useful to look at the bibliography of Łepki, prepared by Jewhen Pełeński, from this perspective: Є. Пеленський, *Богдан Ленкий 1872-1941. Збірник у пошану пам'яті поета*, Краків-Львів 1943, pp. 47-73. On B. Łepki's input in the popularization of Ukrainian culture in Poland wrote: M. Siwicki, 'Bohdan Łepki. (W setną rocznicę urodzin)', *Slavia Orientalis*, No. 4 (1972), p. 429; idem, 'Краківський амбасадор української культури' in *Церковний календар*, Варшава 1972, pp. 118-134; idem, *Богдан Ленкий. Життя і творчість*, Київ 1993; idem, 'Jubileusz Bohdana Łepkiego', *Krakowskie Zeszyty Ukrainoznawcze*, Vol. 1-2 (1993), pp. 243-246; W. Mokry, 'Bohdan Łepki', *Ruch Literacki*, Vol. 19, No. 4/5 (1978), pp. 319-323; idem, 'Postać Iwana Mazepy w trylogii Bohdana Łepkiego', *Krakowskie Zeszyty Ukrainoznawcze*, Vol. 1-2 (1993), pp. 271-281; R. Łużny, 'Profesor Bohdan Łepki w kręgu problematyki literatury ukraińskiej w Polsce', *Krakowskie Zeszyty Ukrainoznawcze*, Vol. 1-2 (1993), pp. 255-261; E. Wiśniewska, 'Rola Bohdana Łepkiego w procesie popularyzacji literatury ukraińskiej w Polsce', *Krakowskie Zeszyty Ukrainoznawcze*, Vol. 1-2 (1993), pp. 263-270; R. Rusnak, 'Bohdan Łepki jako autor polskiej i ukraińskiej wersji "Zarysu literatury ukraińskiej"' in W. Mokry (ed.), *Harmonijne współistnienie kultury Wschodu i Zachodu na Ukrainie*, Kraków 2000, pp. 124-136. See also O. Hnatiuk, L. Szost (eds.), *Stepowa legenda. Antologia ukraińskiej małej formy prozatorskiej lat 1890-1930*, Warszawa 2001; O. Hnatiuk, K. Kotyńska (eds.), *Prolog, nie epilog... Poezja ukraińska w polskich przekładach (pierwsza połowa XX wieku)*, Warszawa 2002; H. Білик, *Богдан Ленкий*, Тернопіль 2001, pp. 122-136.

²⁵ It was a period when many Ukrainian circles and personalities representing the world of science, culture and politics tried fruitlessly to establish their own university. Here is the list of the most important events and facts: in the fall of 1901 a dramatic fight at the Lvov University which later took the form of secession and subsequent bloody battles at the same university in 1906; Polish-Ukrainian riots at the Lvov University in 1907 which met with the severe reaction of the Polish press ('The Slavic World' included) which denied the Ukrainian students the right to their own university; 1908 Mirosław Siczyński – a Ukrainian student killed Andrzej Potocki – the governor of Galicia.

Thanks to the work of Łepki, Cracow's 'Slavophiles' gained new, important collaborators in Lvov. They were the scholars and activists Aleksander Barwiński²⁶ and Cyryl (Kyryło) Sudyński,²⁷ who were distinguished when it came to the development of Polish-Ukrainian dialogue. In the early years of their activity, the Slavic Club and 'The Slavic World' surprised not only Polish but also Ukrainian public opinion with their openness to Ukrainian issues. Like no other Polish organization the members and supporters of the Club declared their will and need for co-operation with the Ukrainians, motivated by the common interests of Poland and Ukraine. An opinion from the Chronicle of 'The Slavic World' gives voice to this attitude: 'Polish Slavophiles would be good for nothing if they did not begin their activity with friendliness towards Russia, and it would be silly to mark wider political horizons if in that closest thing, namely Russo-Polish relations, we came not only to an agreement but also to sincere brotherhood. To reach this aim is, we think, the touchstone of Polish political bravery and competence; to miss it is a sign of incompetence. So we remain resolute friends of the Ruthenians and we hope that we will be able to conduct calmly in "The Slavic World" the criticism of mutual relations and mutual mistakes. We only care for the truth. As people of good will, who gave proof of that, we ask only for trust.'²⁸

THE NEED TO LEARN THE NAME

Marian Zdziechowski, who realized the need to learn the history of Ukraine and its relations with Poland and Russia, came to the conclusion that the first step towards understanding Ukraine and its relations with its neighbours would be to take a position on the proper nouns used to mark Ukraine: *Rus*, *Little Russia*, *Rus-Ukraine* (or *Ukraine-Rus*)²⁹. The Cracow elites were obliged to react to the new name of Ukraine

²⁶ Alesander Barwiński presented to the members of Slavic Club an essay: "About Russian issue", which was published as a separate article in 'The Slavic World'. The echo of that address can be found in the report on the Club's session. The issues discussed in that report, and especially the statement of M. Zdziechowski showed how important it was for the Cracow Slavophiles to gain Ukrainian collaborators: 'Whenever we talk in our Club about the Russian matters then the room is full of listeners. That was also the case during the address of Counsellor and MP Aleksander Barwiński; and the discussion that took place after the address was one of the most heated in the four years of the Club's existence. The speech of the Russian guest was preceded by M. Zdziechowski who thanked him for his readiness to make a speech at the Club, adding that we are delighted to have at our institution every Ruthenian scholar, coming to us with good will and willingness to discuss issues.' 'Posiedzenie Klubu Słowiańskiego', *Świat Słowiański*, No. 12 (1905), p. 502.

²⁷ In 'The Slavic Word' there appears an article of C. Studyński: 'History of Moscowphilia in Galicia'. Cf. C. Studyński, 'Z dziejów moskalofilstwa w Galicji', *Świat Słowiański*, No. 10 (1905).

²⁸ 'Kronika', *Świat Słowiański*, No. 12 (1905), p. 508.

²⁹ In this case it is worthwhile to emphasize the decision of the Ruthenians about the change of the name. This is a phenomenon in constituting of modern Ukraine. Something like this never happened in Polish political movement and hence there arose problems with the acceptance of the new name by some Polish circles or even by most of the Polish society at the turn of the century.

when Mychajł Hruszewski, the most distinguished Ukrainian historian published his fundamental work: 'The History of Ukraine-Rus'.³⁰

The question of the name became one of the main problems discussed in 'The Slavic World'. Irrespective of Hruszewski's position, Cracow opinion-forming elites, Zdziechowski included, understood the term *Ukraine-Rus* differently both philologically and historically.

The immediate reason for the beginning of the so-called 'Ukrainian philological policy' was a critical letter to the editor from 'one of the *Ruthenian* authors'³¹ who wrote: 'Even Russian papers call us *Ukrainians*, and our Club in the Duma is also called *Ukrainian* and not *Ruthenian* or *Rus*. If the Russian government and the Russian press do not call us that name which we do not recognize and do not like, I do not know why the "Slavic World" wants to cause us this distress.'³² It was the editor who answered such a categorical accusation. Koneczny did not agree with his Ukrainian opponent and stressed the importance of the term *Ruthenians* because, according to him: 'Polish and Russian are different in that respect. The term *Ukrainian*, covering the whole nation, was created as a reaction against the Russian term *Little Russian*, and they used it to distinguish themselves from Russians who call themselves *Russcy*. A Russian, acknowledging the national identity of the Ruthenians, cannot express it differently than calling them Ukrainians. It is a different story in the Polish language. We have called you *Ruthenians* since the 13th century and for 700 years nobody thought that we wanted to cause you distress by doing so. In the Polish language, *Ukraine* is a geographical concept not ethnographical and it indicates only a part of Ruthenia. The term *Ukrainian* (to indicate the whole nation) is necessary in the Russian language because it clears things up; in the Polish language the opposite is the case.'³³ The author of the 'philological pol-

³⁰ On the one hundred anniversary of national awakening in 1898 (the one hundred anniversary of publishing of 'the Aeneid' by Iwan Kotlarewski), Mychajł Hruszewski prepared and published first volume of 'History of Ukraine-Rus' (Vol. 1-10, 1898-1937) which was the first synthesis of the Ukrainian history. This work had a large importance not only for the crystallization of the national awareness of the Ukrainians, but also it took a position on the name Rus-Ukraine, Ukraine. Let us remember that in his work Hruszewski explained the concept of Rus in this way: "it is an old name, used in the Old Ruthenian times (...) it contains wishes, dreams and hopes of the contemporary Ukraine. The name Ukraine melts with these endeavours and hopes, with that eruption of the Ukrainian life, which for later generations becomes a leading fire, incessant spring of national and socio-political awareness, hope for the possibility of rebirth and development (...) To stress the connections of the new Ukrainian life with its old forms, that Ukrainian name was used also (in the last quarter of the 19th century) as a compound Ukraina-Rus, Ukrainian-Ruthenian. The old traditional name connected with the new term of national rebirth and movement. However, in recent times one encounters more often both in the Ukrainian literature and others the simple name Ukraine, Ukrainian which supplants other names." (М. Грушевський, *Історія України-Руси*, Vol. 1, виданне третє, доповнене, Київ 1913, p. 2). See also: J. Hrycak, *Historia Ukrainy 1772-1999. Narodziny nowoczesnego narodu*, trans. by K. Kotyńska, Lublin 2000, p. 97.

³¹ F. Koneczny, 'Polityka filologiczna (Kronika)', *Świat Słowiański*, Vol. 1 (1906), p. 454.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

icy' admitted that the Ruthenians had the right to define themselves as they wish, but he explained that at the same time: 'we understood (...) from the very beginning of "The Slavic World" that in Russian the Ruthenians are called Ukrainians.'³⁴ However, he made it clear that the Polish position would remain unchanged, unless it was modified by the most competent institution overseeing these matters, namely the Academy of Knowledge. 'When something is called in Polish, it is no longer a Ruthenian thing but Polish. In Poland it is not politicians but writers, dictionary makers and not our editorial staff but rather the Academy of Knowledge which should have its say in this linguistic matter. We do not think that we are competent to change the name that has been around for seven hundred years; if, however, the Academy of Knowledge adopts this term in its publications we will be willing to follow, not having any aspirations to our own position in philological matters.'³⁵ According to Koneczny, the centuries-long tradition and national history made it necessary to keep in the Polish language the terms *Ruthenia* and *Ruthenians*, as for seven hundred years the Ruthenians were a separate nation and no alteration was needed here. Answering grievances of the 'alleged representatives' of the Ukrainian national movement, Koneczny wrote, 'We can keep the names *Ukraine*, *Ukrainian* in the Ruthenian meaning of these terms in the articles sent to us by the Ruthenians in Polish, leaving to the authors the responsibility that readers understand them the right way, taking into account the Polish meaning of these terms. But the editing staff must not write in bad Polish. If any of the Ruthenians suspects that because of that we are intentionally trying to cause the Ruthenians distress, we will say that they are picking holes. It would be funny accusation to level at "The Slavic World" when we have clamoured for the Ruthenians for the last year and a half. (...) Apparently politics is not yet cultivated by you since you have the time to produce it artificially from philology and worry that your Motherland, Ruthenia is in Polish much bigger than Ukraine...'³⁶

Also Ludwik Kolanowski tried to explain in the monthly the meaning of the terms *Ruthenia*, *Ruthenian* – *Ukraine*, *Ukrainian*. Referring to the statement of M. Hruszewski,³⁷ he again pointed to the unfortunate usage by the Ukrainians of the term *Ruthenian* beside *Ukrainian*: 'We think that the terminology *Ukrainian*, *Ukrainian nation*, instead of *Ruthenian nation*, is very unfortunate. It sounds a little embarrassing, as it constitutes a kind of resignation from the great history of the Ruthenian state; it narrows the historical tradition and does not reflect the feeling of the wider population. – We keep it only in the report.'³⁸

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 454-455.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ This time the matter was the position: M. Hruszewski, 'Oswobodzenie Rossii i ukraińskijskij wopros', *Ukraińskijskij Sbornik*, 1909.

³⁸ L. Kolanowski, 'Pomysły i idee ukraińskie prof. M. Hruszewskiego', *Świat Słowiański*, Vol. 1 (1908), p. 20.

Independently from the discussion in 'The Slavic World' of the topic of the meaning of the term *Ruthenia-Ukraine*, this problem was picked up by the Ukrainian scholar Bohdan Barwiński who was known to the Cracow Slavists. In his work published in 1909 he presented the historical development 'of the name of the Ukrainian-Ruthenian nation.'³⁹ The quick reaction of the monthly to Barwiński's publication⁴⁰ showed the importance of the understanding of the term *Ruthenia*.

An anonymous reviewer (probably F. Koneczny), following Barwiński, tried to explain the functioning of the name Ukraine in history. He put particular emphasis on the relationship of Muskovy with Ruthenia-Ukraine,⁴¹ explaining to the readers of the monthly the necessity of the introduction of the term *Ukrainians* by the Ruthenians: 'If anybody accuses the southern-Ruthenian nation of coining a new name, they should realize that it is the northern-Ruthenian nation that is guilty here, as they took over from the southern-Ruthenian nation its own historical name; and they did not hang on to it but they coined for themselves even more artificial names.'⁴²

Marian Zdziechowski, who by being involved in the Ukrainian issues, triggered off the question of the name did not get involved in the repositioning of 'philological policy' and did not take such a categorical stance towards the term *Ruthenia-Ukraine*

³⁹ Cf. Б. Барвінський, *Історичний розвій імені українсько-руського народу*, Львів 1909.

⁴⁰ [F. Koneczny?], 'Dr. Bohdan Barwinskij. Istorycznyj rozwiij imeny ukrainsko-ruskoho narodu', *Świat Słowiański*, Vol. 2 (1909), pp. 54-56.

⁴¹ It is worthwhile to quote the following fragment from 'The Slavic World': 'The name *Ruthenia* was used originally, since the 9th century, to describe the peoples of the southern Ruthenia and the peoples of the northern Ruthenia, coming into historical existence only in the 12th, appropriated it (bula zachoptena) in the 14th century after political downfall of the Southern Ruthenia. The same is the case with the names *Russia*, *Ruscia*, *Reussen* – and still in the 14th century, the name *Moscovia* was used in clear contrast with *Russia*, and lingua *ruthenica* was distinguished from *moschovitica*. The newer name *Rosija* indicates since the 17th century the state founded by the peoples of the northern Russia. The term *Russi* was used since the earliest times in the West to describe the southern-Ruthenian nation, and only after its political downfall that name was switched to the northern-Ruthenian nation. The newer German name *Russen* denotes both tribes. In the 14th century the Halic-Vladimir state was called *Russia minor* as a part of the southern Russia; since the 17th century the name *Małorosija* was used to denote the whole southern Russia and the northern Russia began to use an artificially coined term: *Welykorusij*; hence the German terms *Klainerusland* and *Grossrussland* – both names artificial and non-scientific. Apart from the names: *Russia*, *Russi*, the names: *Ruthenia* and *Rutheni* were used in the West since the earliest times to describe the northern Russia. The second pair was used to denote the southern Russia till the modern times and hence one can encounter the German *Ruthenen*, used since the 18th in the official German documents (and so not invented by the Austrian government only in 1848). The northern-Ruthenian nation soon dropped the appropriated name *Ruthenia* and named its state using the artificially coined term *Welykorusija* and then in short *Russia* and people with an adjective *Russian*. The historical names: *Ruthenia*, *Ruthenian* have been preserved till today only among the southern-Ruthenian nation especially in Galicia. In the 17th century emerges in *Podnieprze* a new name: *Ukraine*. Since the 12th century all borderlands were called *Ukrainian*. The tradition of the Cossack wars enhanced that name and in 19th century it was extended to the whole southern Ruthenia as *Ruthenia-Ukraine* in contrast to *Muskovy Ruthenia*.' [F. Koneczny?], 'Dr. Bohdan Barwinskij...', p. 54-56.

⁴² Ibid.

as, for instance, Koneczny. In accordance with the conviction of the Club milieu and 'The Slavic World' he used the name *Ruthenian*, although writing in 1888 about Taras Szewczenko i Mikołaj Gogol he courageously stated: 'Ukraine gave birth to two great poets in this century...' ⁴³ In the period when after 1918 as Ukraine moved closer to statehood, Zdziechowski began to officially use the term proposed by the Ukrainians. ⁴⁴ It is worth pointing out that the question of the Ukrainian name was not treated in such an uncompromising way in 'Criticism,' edited by Wilhelm Feldman, as it was in 'Slavic World,' which did not accept the decisions and convictions of Hruszewski ⁴⁵ and Barwiński ⁴⁶ and that part of Ukrainian society who wished to name themselves *Ruthenians-Ukrainians*, or simply *Ukrainians*. Feldman's acknowledgement of the national aspirations of the Ukrainians was evidence of his greater understanding of the process of shaping of the new national awareness of Ruthenians-Ukrainians; and his acceptance of the new name was direct proof of this. ⁴⁷

Many other Polish circles when discussing Ukrainian topics could not understand the terms *Ruthenia-Ukraine*, *Ruthenians-Ukrainians*. In the literature on this subject, the name *Ruthenian* was used to denote Ukrainians from the Eastern Galicia and also from the part belonging to the Tsarist Empire. According to Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński the term *Ukraine* did not denote, as he wrote: 'any ethnographical concept (...) but the territory where people live.' ⁴⁸ Also for the German-speaking

⁴³ M. Zdziechowski, *Mesyaniści i słowianofile. Szkice z psychologii narodów słowiańskich*, Kraków 1888, p. 307.

⁴⁴ Cf. idem, 'Polska po roku 1863', *Przegląd Współczesny*, No. 117-118 (1932); idem, 'Edward Woyniłłowicz w ostatnich latach swojego życia. Tragedia Kresów' (printed in the short form in *Nasza Przyszłość*, Vol. 27 (1933), pp. 12-26); idem, 'Pierwiastek zachowawczy w idei ukraińskiej', *Przegląd Współczesny*, No. 3-4 (1937); idem, 'Ukraina a Rosja. Trylogia Bohdana Łepkiego', *Słowo*, No. 111, 118, 132, 139 (Wilno 1938).

⁴⁵ Cf. L. Kolanowski, 'Pomysły i i idee...', p. 20.

⁴⁶ [F. Koneczny?], 'Dr. Bohdan Barwinski...', p. 54-56.

⁴⁷ W. Feldman noticed in the Polish society not only the clear lack of acceptance for the new Ukrainian name but also for the new 'political formation' which wished to be called *Ukrainians*: "Although, Galician authorities e.g. National School Council do not recognize *Ukrainians*, the awareness of a common link and common aspirations becomes clearer (...) on both sides of the cordon. The revolution of 1905 in Russia, constitutional era, first Duma, showed at once real-political meaning of that fact. St. Petersburg Duma saw, what would be impossible earlier, a 'Ukrainian club' having 40 members. There were tight links between the club and Galician Ruthenians. The Ruthenian issue stopped being the Galician issue. It became necessary to take a broader view, to treat the issue in another way..." (W. Feldman, *Stronictwa i programy polityczne w Galicji (1846-1906)*, Kraków 1907, pp. 352-353). It is worth noticing that apart from Feldman also Jan Baudouin de Courtenay understood the need for the new name for the Ruthenians; he wrote: 'They pick on and offend the Ukrainians because they steadily and obstinately call them Ruthenians and do not deign to call them the Ukrainians the way they want it. To force the Ukrainians even by local authorities to use in official applications the terms *Ruthenian* or *Rusiński* instead of *Ukrainian* is annoyance and provocation. It goes without saying that such ignoring of Ukrainians' wishes is favourable for Russia.' Quoted in M. Łesiów, *Ukraina wczoraj i dziś*, Lublin 1995, p. 6.

⁴⁸ F. Rawita-Gawroński, 'Nazwa Ukrainy, jej początek i charakter', *Ruś*, 1911, p. 45.

writers the name *Ruthenians* (German *Ruthenen*) was the term used to describe the Ukrainian ethnic group in the Habsburg monarchy.⁴⁹ Leon Wasilewski, a friend of Józef Pilsudski, was one of the first and few supporters of the national rebirth of Ruthenians-Ukrainians. According to him their settlements stretched 'from the south of Minsk to the Black and Azov seas, from Hungarian Transcarpathia to Don and Kuban.'⁵⁰ Only in the years that followed did the difference between the usage of the terms *Ukrainians* and *Ruthenians* became clearer, and the latter were often seen as our brother Poles, the quiet inhabitants of the eastern Galicia, whereas the Ukrainians were seen as members of a separate nation, usually hostile to the Poles.⁵¹

THE PROBLEM OF UKRAINIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY

Marian Zdziechowski tried to understand where the main difficulty in the development of the Polish-Ukrainian dialogue lied. He thought that the failures were caused not only because of political reasons but were located much deeper, in that the Poles did not know and understand the Ukrainian culture and mentality; but were most apparent in the difficulty of the Ukrainians with their national self-identity. The work in which Zdziechowski dealt with these issues was his doctoral thesis 'Messianists and Slavophiles. Sketches on the Psychology of the Slavic Nations.'⁵²

The author devoted the treatise to the analysis of patriotic and mystical currents in Poland and Slavdom of the first half of the 19th century. He wrote about such outstanding Polish messianists as Adam Mickiewicz, Juliusz Słowacki and Zygmunt Krasiński. In this work Zdziechowski popularized distinctly two phenomena: Ukrainian messianism and the attitude of the people described as 'Russian Slavophiles.'

As the author indicated in the introduction, "Messianists and Slavophiles" is the first comparative work among modern Slavic literatures.⁵³ He expressed his hope that the book would be understood not only among the Poles but also other

⁴⁹ M. Kłańska, 'O "narodzie popów, chłopów" i hajdamaków' in eadem, *Daleko od Wiednia. Galicja w oczach pisarzy niemieckojęzycznych 1772-1918*, Kraków 1991, p. IX.

⁵⁰ L. Wasilewski, *Ukraina i sprawa ukraińska*, Kraków 1911, p. IX.

⁵¹ Cf. T. Stegner, 'Czy wschód? Polskie środowiska opiniotwórcze wobec Ukrainy w XIX i XX wieku' in T. Stegner (ed.), *Wschód – Zachód – Ukraina. Materiały z sesji naukowej*, Gdańsk 1999. Cf. also: Z. Fras, *Galicja*, Wrocław 1999, p. 208.

⁵² The sketches were written in several stages; their book edition was preceded by articles written in the Polish press in St. Petersburg. However, he developed his project, devoted to selected issues of the Slavonic messianic thought, since 1882. Let us remember here that the positive reception of the book by Cracow academia in 1888 opened for young Zdziechowski the road to the academic career at the Jagiellonian University. Moreover, 'Messianists...', as the author himself stated in the introduction was 'the first comparative work in the field of modern Slavic literatures', and hence the author hoped that the book would be understood not only by the Poles but also by other Slavs.

⁵³ M. Zdziechowski, *Mesyaniści...*, p. VI.

Slavs.⁵⁴ As a young expert of comparative literature Zdziechowski warned that he was entering 'virgin scholarly territory,' and that the picture described by him would not be 'homogenous and exhaustive,' and was supposed to be 'a sequence of sketches linked by a common idea dealing with a limited number of facts and main persons.'⁵⁵

Zdziechowski thought that Taras Szewczenko and Mikołaj Gogol are the most representative members of the Ukrainian messianism. At the same time, he stated that to be a messianist in Poland or a Slavophile in Russia provided one with two sets of perceptions and studies in comparative psychology. It is necessary to stress the fact that Zdziechowski in this work identifies Mikołaj Gogol as a Ukrainian: 'Two great poets (Szewczenko and Gogol) were born in Ukraine in our century.'⁵⁶ With this statement Zdziechowski opened an important chapter in his deliberations on the Ukrainian nation, a subject on which he would write for many years, especially in his last work devoted to the trilogy of Bohdan Łepki.⁵⁷

A chapter of the treatise that dealt with the literary output of Szewczenko and Gogol was devoted not to its artistic value but rather to its ideological worth, and to the world views of these writers.

Zdziechowski began the discussion of the world view of Szewczenko with the presentation of a detailed, almost psychological biography. He wished to present the connection of the writer with the people and the environment where he grew up and lived, to 'adopt the Tainian stance of the psychology of individuals and tribes and to look deep into the soul of the author and the nation where he grew up.'⁵⁸

Having such a view of the subject of his research, Zdziechowski was able to single out the essential characteristics of Szewczenko's work. He noticed most of all the strongest of all the feelings contained in Szewczenko's poetry – love for the motherland, admiration of the beauty of that feeling. Zdziechowski wrote: 'the Ukrainian motives of Szewczenko are charming, being inspired by love of country.'⁵⁹ He notices that 'in thoughts, feelings and works of Szewczenko there is always sincere compassion for the suffering of the lower classes together with passionate attachment to the motherland (...)'⁶⁰ Zdziechowski acknowledges that Szewczenko, who spent 24 years of his life in serfdom, knows the peasant soul very well, much better than Gogol.⁶¹

⁵⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, p. VII. It is worth noting here, that 136 years have passed since the appearance of Zdziechowski's work but most of the scholars of Ukrainian issues in Poland, but also in Ukraine did not pay attention to the chapter devoted to Szewczenko and Gogol. Among exceptions are review of I. Frank and short references to this problem in contemporary (mentioned before) works of J. Skoczyński and W. Mokry.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 307.

⁵⁷ Cf. *idem*, 'Ukraina a Rosja. Trylogia Bohdana Łepkiego' in *idem*, *Widmo przyszłości...*, pp. 195-226.

⁵⁸ *Idem*, *Mesyjańści...*, p. V.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 283.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 284.

He also concedes that Szewczenko had a better intuition for 'the national feeling'. According to Zdziechowski it is exemplified in the poetry of Szewczenko, especially by his attachment to historical motives and figures. He quotes Szewczenko on the importance of history: 'What is more conducive to uphold the national spirit in its fight with a dangerous reality than the thought about its past fame and glory.'⁶² He also focused on prophetism, comparing Szewczenko with Krasiński, which is present in the Ukrainian bard's poetry: 'like Krasiński he was protected from desperation by deeply rooted religious feelings and, connected with them, the faith in the curative and ennobling effect of poetry. According to Szewczenko, poetry is a dialogue with God, which takes us from this vale of tears and brings us to heaven; the poet is a harbinger of God and a comforter of sufferers.'⁶³ In Zdziechowski's opinion such statements place Szewczenko among the representatives of messianism, and, even more importantly, Ukrainian messianism.

So Zdziechowski is a pioneer when he includes the author of 'Dead Souls' among the Ukrainian messianists. Zdziechowski analyzes the work of Gogol using the Tainian-Brandesian interpretation and it gives him the opportunity to look at him as an outstanding member of Ukrainian messianism. He wrote about it suggestively: 'We did not talk about Gogol when we talked about the Slavophiles, and only now after a brief outline of his mystical dreams can we mention him as a curiosity. When we do research on messianic currents, as far as it could help us to define some traits of the Slavic nations, our aims are rather psychological than historical-literary, and for that reason we put Gogol next to Szewczenko. Although the whole of his writings belong to Russian literature, he is a full-blooded Ukrainian in terms of his origins, character and views, and hence he has much more in common with the author of "Neophytes" than with the Slavophiles.'⁶⁴

When we analyze Zdziechowski's sketch devoted to the messianism of Szewczenko and Gogol, we touch upon a broader problem, the one dealing with Ukrainian spirituality. Even to mention Gogol in this context means to evoke a particularly difficult and controversial stage in the development of spirituality and also the self-identity of Ukrainian intelligentsia. Taking Gogol as an example, one can see clearly the dilemmas of the whole generation of the young Ukrainian intelligentsia, which were described as 'spiritually split,' between the motherland that was politically dead and the Empire which was attractive culturally but completely intolerant.⁶⁵ Thus the first half

⁶² Ibid., p. 285.

⁶³ Ibid., pp. 284-285.

⁶⁴ Ibid., pp. 290-291.

⁶⁵ Cf. G. Luckyj, *Between Gogol' and Sevcenko. Polarity in the literary Ukraine. 1798-1847*, München 1978 (Ukrainian translation – 1998); W. Mokry, 'Ukraina i Ukraińcy w kulturze rosyjskiej od połowy XVII do początku XX wieku (zarys problematyki)' in R. Łużny (ed.), *Literatura rosyjska i jej kulturowe konteksty*, Wrocław-Kraków 1990, pp. 169-182; W. Mokry, *Literatura i myśl filozoficzno-religijna ukraińskiego romantyzmu. Szewczenko, Kostomarow, Szaszkiewicz*, Kraków 1996, pp. 137, 138, 175; A. Hnatiuk, 'Geopolityka w literaturze ukraińskiej' in T. Stegner (ed.), *Wschód – Zachód – Ukraina...*, p. 108; J. Hrycak, *Historia Ukrainy...*, p. 39.

of the nineteenth century was the time of 'dramatic choices,' symbolically described by Jurij Łucki as the choice 'between Gogol and Szewczenko,'⁶⁶ between the culture of the Empire and the national culture.⁶⁷ This view of the problem corresponds with the theory of 'four Ukrainian types,'⁶⁸ promoted by Mykoła Szlemkewycz.⁶⁹ Two of the distinguished types that the Ukrainian philosopher names are the Gogol type and the Szewczenko type.

Such an interpretation of Gogol's work and biography shows Zdziechowski's originality and his fresh outlook on the history of the reception of Gogol's work in both Poland and the world. Stating that Gogol expressed Ukrainian mentality, Zdziechowski begins his polemic with Wisarion Bieliński – one of the most authoritative Russian critics of the nineteenth century. Zdziechowski and Polish literary opinion at that time also thought highly of Bieliński.⁷⁰ It was largely because of him that Gogol was treated not only as a Russian writer but also as an exponent of the Russian soul, and Russian mentality.⁷¹ He expressed his opinion about 'Ukrainian' literature in this manner: 'The history of Little Russia is a tributary that reached the great river of Russia. Little Russians were always a tribe and never constituted a nation, to say nothing about a state... A tribe may have only folk songs but it can not have poets. Only great nations have great poets, but what kind of a nation

⁶⁶ Concerns the work: G. Luckyj, *Between Gogol' and...*

⁶⁷ This problem is understood in the same way by those historians who show the examples of M. Gogol and T. Szewczenko as diametrically different life choices of the young Ukrainians in the political and cultural history of their country (it refers to the 1830s). According to translated in Poland contemporary Ukrainian historian J. Hrycak, M. Gogol is, 'A *Little Russian* who combined his sympathy for Ukraine, its nature, songs etc with the faithful service to the Russian Empire. He is one of the typical figures of the political and cultural history of Ukraine of the 19th century'. For Hrycak, M. Gogol becomes a symbol of that part of the Ukrainian society which was immersed in the apathy of colonial province and could no longer distinguish between the Ukrainian and Russian national character, 'A typical example of that kind of a man was a famous writer Mikołaj Gogol. He was born in a family of Cossack lineage and successfully made his debut in the Russian literature as an author of short stories with Ukrainian themes. Gogol thought that his soul consists of two parts: Ukrainian and Russian, and that they complemented each other. The essential differences between the Russian and Ukrainian national character were, according to him, only the reason for their future connection in one unity, which would show to the world a new, more perfect entity.' In assessment of J. Hrycak, T. Szewczenko differs radically from M. Gogol, but what makes them different is not their social origin but their attitude towards Russia: 'He placed the blame on Russia and Russian tsars for the enslavement of Ukraine. Never before Szewczenko, Ukrainian intellectuals raised their voices so adamantly in the protest against Russia. His poetry decisively rejected conformist model of being '*Little Russian*', which was based on the idea of inseparability of the Little and Great Russia and loyalty to the Tsar.' J. Hrycak, *Historia Ukrainy...*, p. 39.

⁶⁸ M. Szlemkewycz (1994-1996) – outstanding Ukrainian philosopher and journalist, emigrant.

⁶⁹ M. Szlemkewycz, *Zagublena ukraińska ludzina*, New York 1954.

⁷⁰ Cf. F. Sielicki, 'Bieliński' in idem, *Dziewiętnastowieczni pisarze rosyjscy w Polsce międzywojennej*, Wrocław 1994, pp. 55-62.

⁷¹ Cf. W.G. Bieliński, 'O opowiadaniu rosyjskim i opowiadaniach p. Gogola: "Arabeski" i "Mirgorod"'; 'O "Rewizorze" Gogola'; 'Przypadki Cziczikowa albo Martwe Dusze' in idem, *Pisma literackie. Wybór*, A. Walicki (ed.), Wrocław 1962.

does not have great and autonomous political importance. A living proof of that truth is Gogol. One encounters many pure Ukrainian elements in his poetry, which cannot exist in the Russian literature, but who would call him a Ukrainian poet?⁷² Zdzichowski summed up his opinion of Bieliński by saying: 'Ukraine has given birth to two great poets in our century...'⁷³

So Zdzichowski openly rejected that kind of the view of Russo-Ukrainian literary relations. Let us realize that his ruminations did not aim to 'steal' Gogol from Russian literature, but that he tried to show the fact that this writer can be perfectly placed in the context of Ukrainian history and literature. A contemporary expert on these issues, Jurij Hrabowycz (George Grabowicz) rightly noticed: 'Gogol can be naturally inscribed in the Ukrainian context and the history of Ukrainian literature; however, he is not removed at this point from the Russian context. In this case, when taking writers into account – the laws of property do not operate. They do not belong, they inscribe themselves. Obviously, they are neither diplomats nor generals who can serve only one country. The best analogy would be to compare writers to saints, who can be encountered in the calendars and canons of the warring sects. Because literature is not only about creation but also reception, so the history of literature is basically the history of its reception.'⁷⁴

Zdzichowski did not appropriate Gogol, but he turned to his work and figure when he tried to 'define certain characteristics' of the Ukrainian nation. He placed Gogol next to Szewczenko who was unquestionably Ukrainian in the view of his contemporary Poles. Such a juxtaposition and presentation of two outstanding Ukrainians gains importance only Zdzichowski's views relating to Eastern Slavdom are comprehensively assessed. In his plans with regard to political science, Ukraine was to serve as a counter-balance to Russia. Gogol is shown here as a 'different' example of a Ukrainian; different in his social origins, life choices and his attitude towards Russia. Thus he is completely different from Szewczenko, but at the same time a representative of the same nation.

Zdzichowski distinguished three factors determining Gogol's national status as a member of the Ukrainian nation: national origins, his character, and his views, on which he put the most emphasis. He did not analyze his views on Ukraine (although in the writer's output there is a lot of material concerning it)⁷⁵ but focussed instead on how he viewed Russia. Zdzichowski omitted the whole cycle of works that constitute the Ukrainian school in Russian literature,⁷⁶ and the writer's opinions about his

⁷² Quoted in W. Mokry, *Literatura i myśl filozoficzno-religijna...*, p. 175. Cf. also: W. Bieliński, *Pożoje sobranije soczinenij*, Moskwa 1955, Vol. 7, p. 60 and Vol. 5, p. 178.

⁷³ M. Zdzichowski, *Meyaniści...*, p. 307.

⁷⁴ G. Grabowicz, 'Gogol i mif Ukrainy', *Suczacnist*, No. 9 (1994), p. 77 (trans. by O. Kich-Maslej).

⁷⁵ Cf. Ж. Ляхова, 'Український лист Миколи Гоголя', *Слово і час*, № 12 (Київ 2001), pp. 57-65; Є. Маланюк, 'Гоголь – Г'ог'оль', *Слово і час*, № 8 (Київ 1991), pp. 5-15; П. Голубенко, 'Українська стихія в творчості Гоголя' in *Україна і Росія у світлі культурних взаємин*, Нью-Йорк–Париж–Торонто 1987, pp. 296-314.

⁷⁶ Cf. Д. Чижевський, *Історія української літератури (від початків до доби реалізму)*, Тернопіль 1994, p. 366; С. Єфремов, *Історія українського письменства*, Київ 1995, p. 309.

links with Ukraine expressed when he was in exile. However, Zdzichowski referred to 'Dead Souls' and 'Inspector,' Gogol's work and thoughts from the 1840s, and most of all to 'Selected fragments from his correspondence with friends' (1847) in which he publicly condemned his earlier work and expressed his praise for autocracy and patriarchal relationships in the country, which caused outrage among liberal circles.

Zdziechowski tried to point out the patriotic feelings of Gogol, which dominated decisively over any other experiences in the life of the writer, 'the passionate love of his country was the strongest feeling in Gogol's soul.'⁷⁷ Zdziechowski detected the similarities and differences between Szewczenko and Gogol in the emotionality present in the works of the poet: 'the fabric of that love was the same physical feeling which we saw with Szewczenko. The difference is that looking at the endless and flowery steppes, he did not feel the longing for the charming landscapes of quiet country nature, for cherry orchards, for white huts and for the mysterious depths of ponds. Gogol loved endless plains which evoked in him not only love but also hope in the great and splendid future of Russia and also gave him a yearning for the work which would inspire his fellow countrymen with love and faith.'⁷⁸

The meaning of Gogol's patriotic feelings is not revealed during the literary-historical analysis but rather during a psychological attempt at the classification of Szewczenko and Gogol. One has to pay attention not only to the intensity of patriotic feelings, which Zdziechowski considered to be a strong point of the Ukrainians, but most of all, to the object of these feelings of both writers: 'flowery steppes, charming country landscapes, cherry orchards, white huts and the mysterious depths of ponds' for which Szewczenko yearns are the essence of Ukraine, whereas Gogol turns to 'the endless plains' which symbolize Russia. This patriotic inconsistency, the dilemma of patriotic Ukrainian messianists between Ukraine and Russia, the feeling completely foreign to Mickiewicz, Słowacki and Krasiński, to whom Zdziechowski compared Szewczenko and Gogol, must have been intriguing for the Polish scholar, hence he devoted so much room in the later part of his work to these issues.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ M. Zdziechowski, *Mesyaniści...*, p. 291.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ The issue of national split in the work of M. Gogol appeared also in Crakow's 'Criticism' in the monthly review of the Ukrainian press, in which Mychajło Moczulski, reviewing the study of Alexandra Efemenko entitled 'National Split in Gogol's Work', wrote: 'There were two contradictory influences having an effect on the author of *Taras Bulba*. Gogol was born in the Ukrainian family. All his childhood he lived in Ukraine. His whole life he uses the Ukrainian language when talking with his compatriots or Polish immigrants (B. Zalewski, A. Mickiewicz). He loves passionately Ukrainian dances, music and songs. He studies the Ukrainian past and is enthusiastic about it. From the other side, he is influenced by school and the Russian literature and the circle of Żukowski, Puszkyn and Smyrnova and innate propensity for intensity, effects and greatness make him adore the Russian imperialism. These contradictions left a distinct mark on Gogol's talent. Ukraine gave him inspiration, he drew from it positive content for his artistic ideas and ideal motives for his work. For Russia, he had negativity and unmercifully wicked humour that can not be imitated. In spite of that, he devoted his pen to Russia and reformed its writing.' M. M-ski, 'Lit. NaukWisnyk, *Krytyka*, 1903, pp. 178-179.

In his study, Zdzichowski on many occasions showed quotes proving that Gogol is a 'Little Russian,' who does not believe that 'Ukrainian nature' and 'Russian nature' are mutually exclusive, but who accepts his 'all-Russian nature'. The point here is not to confirm the thesis put forward by Uljanow in his work on Gogol,⁸⁰ but rather to discern contradictions in the perception of national issues which arose in the last years of this writer, and which were connected with the so-called 'moving away' from the motherland, and the tragic choices of the Ukrainian intellectual, which was convincingly described by Jewhen Małaniuk⁸¹. Before him, Alexander Brückner came to the conclusion that 'none of the Russian writers is so contradictory in his ideology as the author of "Inspector."'⁸²

The psychological classification of Gogol, done by Zdzichowski, is important in the context of Polish, Ukrainian and Russian interest in this writer. We can understand that when reading the fundamental study of Gogol by Jewhen Małaniuk,⁸³ in which the author passes over the less than significant arguments, like 'whether Gogol belongs to the Ukrainian or Russian literature' and focuses instead on a much more important issue; which is to unravel the phenomenon of the writer who is an example of the bitter truth of the stateless Ukrainian nation, which was forced to disperse all its intellectual energy, either assimilating or becoming an intermediary between its own culture or the culture of the Empire.⁸⁴

It is worth mentioning that Małaniuk, writing about the Polish reception of Gogol in 1935, omitted the very significant study of Zdzichowski, as well as the much later works of A. Brückner that emphasized the Ukrainian nature of Gogol: 'In the Polish literary opinion Gogol still remains a "regular" Russian writer, even of large stature, but – because he was Russian – he was also somebody strange and *hostile*. And this peculiar, and in our mutual contacts also tragic situation was not changed by such facts as the Paris meetings and talks of Gogol with Mickiewicz, his friendship with Bogdan Zaleski, and the fact that since 1836 Gogol was in reality in exile.'⁸⁵

As one can see, Zdzichowski perceived much better the gravity of the situation of the Ukrainians of the generation of Gogol and Szewczenko than other scholars of Slavic literature. Just like some of his compatriots, Gogol was not in favour of the

⁸⁰ M. Uljanow in the work, 'The origin of the Ukrainian separatism' formulated a conception according to which Gogol is shown as a consistent 'Little Russian' who did not oppose Ukrainian nature to Russian nature but most of all stressed their 'all-Russian nature'; Szewczenko is juxtaposed here with his 'anti-Muskovism' and 'spiritual Jacobinism.' To this work and to this issue refers also Jurij Barabasz in his study, 'Podteksty tekstu petersburskiego (-ów; -ich) (Gogol i Szewczenko)', *Słowo i Czas*, No. 3 (2001)).

⁸¹ J. Małaniuk, 'Tajemnica Hohola', *Wschód-Orient*, No. 1-2 (1935), pp. 68-70.

⁸² Cf. F. Sielicki, 'Mikołaj Gogol' in idem, *Klasyki dziewiętnastowiecznej prozy...*, p. 61; cf. also G. Grabowicz, Gogol i mif..., *Suczasnist*, No. 9 (1994), pp. 81.

⁸³ Є. Маланюк, 'Тоголь – Г'ог'оль', pp. 5-15.

⁸⁴ Cf. Ю. Ковалів, 'Євген Маланюк', *Слово і час*, № 8 (Київ 1991), p. 6.

⁸⁵ Є. Маланюк, 'Тоголь – Г'ог'оль', p. 6 (trans. by O. Kich-Maslej).

cultural and political separateness of Ukraine, whereas Szewczenko was the personification of the opposite attitude, expressing his faith that the state would be free and distinct from Russia. At that time Szewczenko and Gogol personified two possibilities when it came to the spiritual development of Ukraine: one being pro-independence – represented by Iwan Mazepa, and the second treating Ukraine as Little Russia – a part of Great Russia in accordance with the official Russian ideology.

In his deliberations on Polish-Ukrainian-Russian relationships,⁸⁶ the problems connected with the necessity of Ukraine making a choice of its future political and cultural road – to follow either the East (Russia) or the West (Poland), Zdziechowski invoked Łepki's trilogy 'Mazepa'⁸⁷. In his opinion it became a real answer to the question that he pondered for almost half a century. In the attitude and work of Łepki – a *hot* Ukrainian and *conservative being under the influence of the ideology of Lipiński*⁸⁸ (a poet and writer of *an outstanding talent*) – Zdziechowski discerned a *decisive* European for whom as he wrote, 'the Russian East is something distant, almost foreign.'⁸⁹ The vision of Ukraine presented by Łepki, he considered very successful, as it coincided with the plans of the Polish conservative. It was Ruthenia, which was brought closer together with Poland as opposed to Russia; in this case Bolshevik Russia.⁹⁰ The Ukrainian idea expressed in the historical prose of Łepki made it easier to fulfil that vision of Ruthenia because, according to Zdziechowski, what was realized here was the basic criterion necessary on the road to the spiritual liberation of that nation: 'The first step necessary to create a free, independent and self-reliant Ukraine would be, according to the author, its spiritual liberation, namely the understanding of the thought, of the conviction that Russia and Ukraine are two different worlds, two an-

⁸⁶ M. Zdziechowski, 'Ukraina a Rosja. Trylogia Bohdana Łepkiego', *Słowo*, No. 111, 118, 132, 139 (Wilno 1938).

⁸⁷ Cf. B. Łepki, *Motria. Trylogii "Mazepa" część pierwsza i druga*, trans. by M. Lazar Bieńkowska, Warszawa 1937.

⁸⁸ Cf. M. Zdziechowski, 'Ukraina a Rosja. Trylogia Bohdana Łepkiego' in idem, *Widmo przyszłości...*, p. 201.

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 200.

⁹⁰ Cf. 'Listy Zdziechowskiego do B. Łepkiego' in M. Giergielewicz, 'Bohdan Łepki wśród Polaków' in idem, *Studia i spotkania literackie*, Warszawa 1983, pp. 293-315. It is worth noticing here that, according to Zdziechowski, Bohdan Łepki's position concerning Polish-Ukrainian-Russian relationships was very much like that of the Rev. Lachowicz about whom wrote in the form of anecdote (not lacking political discernment) quoted in the sketch 'Ukraine and Russia' Zygmunt Miłkowski (T.T. Jeż). The Rev. Lachowicz asked about the brotherly nation of the Russians answered emphatically: 'I suppose that they are a nation that is a little, or maybe a lot more brotherly than the Tatars or the Chinese. But they want to eat us, the Ruthenians, and being stronger they will do it. – But the Poles, don't they want the same thing? – Right, they want it, but the question is whether they can? Yes, mister Ludwig, we should stick together, and maybe we shall win and topple the Russians. If not, then both us and you will be devoured by the brotherly nation.' T.T. Jeż finishes by saying that the Reverend was also convinced that an agreement between the Poles and the Ruthenians will be reached sooner or later.' Quoted in M. Zdziechowski, 'Ukraina a Rosja. Trylogia Bohdana Łepkiego' in idem, *Widmo przyszłości...*, p. 202.

tipodes; barbarism and culture personified and opposite to each other in the figures of Peter the Great and Mazepa.⁹¹ Zdziechowski understood that the trilogy 'Mazepa' is the work 'of a man absolutely free from a feeling of *affiliation to Eastern-Slavic tribes*, namely to Russia. The trilogy is the affirmation of Ukraine throwing off Moscow's yoke. It is a wonderful, almost national-epic like the picture of the tragic endeavours of the Ukrainian nation striving for a great goal.'⁹² It was just this that, in spite of it all, let the Polish scholar think positively about the future of Polish-Ukrainian relations.

CLOSING REMARKS

Even a cursory analysis of the described phenomena shows that Poland and the Poles, in spite of living as neighbours for many centuries, had special reasons to 'discover' Ukraine. At the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the Ukrainians remained the nation that was least known and liked among the Poles. It was the opinion-forming Cracow circles, and most of all the circle of Marian Zdziechowski that had a decisive impact when it came to overcoming the negative picture of the Ukrainians, which was rather prevalent in popular Polish attitudes.

The scholar knew the unique nature of borderlands very well, including Polish-Ukrainian borderlands. He thought that their problems constitute a very important and urgent subject of research, and he stressed it repeatedly in Cracow explaining, 'a lot, or maybe everything depends on concord or discord in these lands.'⁹³ When organizing the association, the Slavic Club and later its journal, 'The Slavic World,' he wanted to learn the culture and history of the future neighbour and political ally. He strived to narrow the cultural distance between the Poles and the Ukrainians and their mutual understanding, and he also counted on overcoming the prejudices of the Ukrainian intelligentsia towards the Poles.

Zdziechowski was one of the first to understand that the problems encountered with the development of Polish-Ukrainian dialogue are caused not only by political reasons, but also because the Poles find it difficult to understand the Ukrainian mentality, and, most of all, because the Ukrainians have a problem with their national self-identity. Szewczenko and Gogol are, in the assessment of this scholar, examples of two different mentalities, but mentalities which are still Ukrainian; they are completely different, as different as the contrasting awareness of the elites of the Ukrainian nation at that time. It is not the case that the Ukrainian nation did not know how to choose its way, but it could not. As Zdziechowski wrote in his appraisal of Lęcki's trilogy 'Mazepa,' 'Ukraine and Russia are two worlds that must not be linked.'

Translated by Bogdan Zieliński

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ 'Na początku trzeciego rocznika', *Świat Słowiański*, Vol. 1 (1907), p. 8.

Olga KICH-MASLEJ Ph.D., doctor of humanities in the field of literary studies, assistant lecturer in the Department of Ukrainian Studies at the faculty of International and Political Studies of the Jagiellonian University in Krakow. Co-editor of *History and Political Science Notebooks: 'New Ukraine'* (www.nowaukraina.org); the author of programmes devoted to contemporary Ukraine broadcast by Radio Krakow.